

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/647,448	08/25/2003	Hiroyuki Kumakura	03310.033001	1648
7590 08/24/2005			EXAMINER	
	L & OSHA L.L.P.	HARAN, JOHN T		
Suite 2800 1221 McKinney Street			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Houston, TX 77010			1733	

DATE MAILED: 08/24/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

•		
	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/647,448	KUMAKURA, HIROYUKI
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	John T. Haran	1733
The MAILING DATE of this communication a Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REITHE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIO - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory per - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the material patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	N. 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply within the statutory minimum of thi iod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MOI atute, cause the application to become A	reply be timely filed ty (30) days will be considered timely. NTHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 2a)□ This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ T 3)□ Since this application is in condition for allow closed in accordance with the practice under	his action is non-final. wance except for formal mat	•
Disposition of Claims		
4) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are without 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are rejected. 7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	drawn from consideration.	
Application Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the Exam 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) a Applicant may not request that any objection to to Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the con 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the	accepted or b) objected to the drawing(s) be held in abeya rection is required if the drawing	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). (s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docume 2. Certified copies of the priority docume 3. Copies of the certified copies of the p application from the International Bur * See the attached detailed Office action for a	ents have been received. ents have been received in A priority documents have been reau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No received in this National Stage
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		Summary (PTO-413)
 Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>8/03, 2/04, 3/05</u>. 	(08) . 5) 🔲 Notice of	s)/Mail Date nformal Patent Application (PTO-152) <i>nslation JP 11330162</i> .

Art Unit: 1733

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

1. The information disclosure statements (IDS) submitted on 8/25/03, 2/17/04, and 3/15/05 have been considered by the examiner.

Claim Objections

2. Claim 11 is objected to because of the following informalities: in line 3 the word "heatable" is misspelled. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
 The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 4. Claims 8-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 8 and 9 recite the limitation "the first table". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. It appears these claims should depend from claims 4 and 5, respectively.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

Art Unit: 1733

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claims 1-3 and 6-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Honda et al (U.S. Patent 6,365,840).

Honda et al discloses a method of bonding a semiconductor chip to a substrate with an electrically conductive adhesive such that the connection terminals of the chip and substrate are electrically connected wherein the bonding process includes a first heating and pressing step wherein the opposing connection terminals are not in contact with each other and a second heating and pressing step wherein a stronger pressure and higher temperature is applied to the chip to electrically connect the terminals and cure the adhesive (See Figure 4A-D; Column 8, lines 1-46). Honda et al anticipates claims 1-3 and 6-7.

It is noted that it is unclear if Applicant intends for the language "to connect the opposing connection terminals to each other" to mean a direct contact between the terminals, however the current wording reads on an electrical connection wherein the terminals are connected through the electrically conductive particles of a conductive adhesive.

7. Claims 1-3, 6-7, and 10-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Takeshita et al (U.S. Patent 6,458,236).

Takeshita et al discloses a method of bonding a semiconductor chip to a substrate with an electrically conductive adhesive such that the connection terminals of the chip and substrate are electrically connected wherein the bonding process includes semisetting the adhesive on the substrate with a heated pressure head, placing the chip on semiset adhesive, and pressing the chip with a heated pressure head at a higher temperature to electrically connect the chip to the substrate and cure the adhesive (Column 7, lines 28-59). It is inherent that the placing of the chip involves some degree of pressure of the chip against the heated adhesive. Takeshita et al anticipates claims 1-3, 6-7, and 10-11.

It is noted that it is unclear if Applicant intends for the language "to connect the opposing connection terminals to each other" to mean a direct contact between the terminals, however the current wording reads on an electrical connection wherein the terminals are connected through the electrically conductive particles of a conductive adhesive.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 1733

9. Claims 4-5 and 8-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over one of Honda et al (U.S. Patent 6,365,840) or Takeshita et al (U.S. Patent 6,458,236) taken in view of JP 2-226738 and JP 11-330162.

Regarding claims 4-5 and 8-9, Honda et al and Takeshita et al are silent towards the two pressing steps taking place on different tables, however such is well known and conventional in the assembly art as shown for example in JP 2-226738 (See English abstract). Honda et al and Takeshita et al are also silent toward heating the assembly from the substrate side, however such is well known and conventional in the assembly art as shown for example in JP 11-330162 (See English computer translation, paragraph 0013). Furthermore one skilled in the art would have readily appreciated that heating the support table or heating the pressing head are obvious alternate expedients for heating the assembly. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use conventional techniques in the methods of Honda et al and Takeshita et al such as performing each pressing step on a separate tables and heating the tables to provide the necessary bonding temperature.

10. Claims 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over one of Honda et al (U.S. Patent 6,365,840) or Takeshita et al (U.S. Patent 6,458,236) taken in view of JP 11-330162.

Regarding claims 12 and 13, Honda et al and Takeshita et al are silent towards connecting the terminals and then heating the adhesive to the second temperature for curing the adhesive, however such is well known and conventional as shown for

Art Unit: 1733

example in JP 11-330162 (See computer translation paragraphs 0016-0017). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use conventional techniques in the methods of Honda et al and Takeshita et al pressing such that the terminals are connected and then heating the adhesive to the second temperature for curing the adhesive.

11. Claims 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takeshita et al (U.S. Patent 6,458,236) in view of Honda et al (U.S. Patent 6,365,840).

Regarding claims 10 and 11, Takeshita et al is silent towards the pressing heads being heated, however such is well known and conventional as shown for example in Honda et al. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use conventional techniques in the method Takeshita et al such as heating the pressure head.

Conclusion

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John T. Haran whose telephone number is (571) 272-

1217. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th (8 - 5) and alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Blaine Copenheaver can be reached on (571) 272-1156. The fax phone

Page 7

Application/Control Number: 10/647,448

Art Unit: 1733

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Jóhn T. Haran Primary Examiner Art Unit 1733